In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

In re the Application of:		CENTRAL FAX CENTE
Viktors Berstis)	OCT 1 2 2005
Serial Number: 10/015,492)	Group: 2625
Docket Number: AUS920011012US1)	Examiner: Sathyanaraya V. Perungavoor
Filed on: 12/13/2001)	
For: "System and Method for Anti-Moiré)	
Imaging in a Two Dimensional Sensor)	
Array")	

APPEAL BRIEF

Real Party in Interest per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(i)

The subject patent application is owned by International Business Machines Corporation of Armonk, NY.

Related Appeals and Interferences per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(ii)

The present patent application is related to US Patent Application number 10/015,880, docket number AUS920011011US1, which is under appeal from final rejections. No decision from a court or the Board has been rendered in this related appeal.

Status of Claims per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(iii)

Claims 1 - 19 were finally rejected in the Examiner's decision of May 16, 2005. Claims 1, 7, 9, and 12 were amended on February 3, 2005. Claims originally filed numbered as 16 - 20 were renumbered to 15- 19 by the examiner, as no claim number 15 was originally presented.

The rejections of Claims 1 - 19 were appealed by Appellant on September 16, 2006.

Status of Amendments after Final Rejections per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(iv)

No amendments to the claims have been submitted or entered after final rejections.

Viktors Berstis

Page 2 of 14

Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(v)

The invention relates to devices and methods for producing sampled images, such as digital or digitized images, in a manner to avoid producing Moiré patterns. A two-dimensional sensor array is provided which has non-uniformly spaced sensors such that it avoids production of an inherent "frequency" that may interfere or resonate with details or harmonics present in the image source. The sensors are disposed in the a two-dimensional, non-uniform pattern according to a predetermined scheme or function. An image is captured using the non-uniformly placed sensors, and optionally, linear interpolation is applied to the non-uniformly spaced data set to yield a synthesized uniformly-spaced data set for use in common imaging formats and processing, such as JPEG or MPEG compression and decompression.

More specifically, we have claimed method, computer-readable medium and system embodiments of the invention in independent claims 1, 9, and 12, respectively, as follows:

- (a) determining a plurality of sensor positions having a position-to-position spacing in a first axis (pg. 11, lines 11 17) from a datum point according to a first non-uniform predictable deterministic distribution schema (pg. 12 line 6 pg. 13 line 2), and each position having a spacing in a second axis (pg. 11, lines 20 22) from the datum point according to a second predictable deterministic non-uniform distribution schema (pg. 12 line 6 pg. 13 line 2);
- (b) providing a two-dimensional array of sensors, each sensor being positioned on the array according to the determined positions in said first and second axes (pg. 17 lines 1 7, pg. 14 lines 10 19); and
- (c) providing a means for sampling (pg. 10 lines 9 11, pg. 17 lines 8 9) said sensors such that a two-dimensional imaging sensor array having non-uniform sensor distribution is realized.

An advantage to our invention is that the use of a predictable deterministic function to calculate the position of a sensor in one or two axes allows for an image data set (e.g. the actual data samples in a JPEG or bitmap file) to be properly interpreted by a recipient without the need for any look up tables (pg. 12 lines 10 - 13) to be associated with the image or complicated image processing functions, only requiring the knowledge of the actual distribution function parameters and a seed value (e.g. CRC parameters and values) (pg. 12 line 21 - pg. 13 line 2).

Viktors Berstis

Page 3 of 14

Grounds for Rejection For Which Review is Sought per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(vi)

Appellant requests review by the Board of the rejections of claims 1 - 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 4,574,311 to Resnikoff, et al. (hereinafter "Resnikoff") in view of publication "Lfsr Counters Implement Binary Polynomial Generators" by Balph (hereinafter "Balph").

Arguments per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(vii)

Rejections of Claims 1 - 19 over Resnikoff in View of Balph

In the rationale for the final rejections of Claims 1 - 4, 6 - 9, 10, 12 - 17, and 19 - 21

Resnikoff in view of Balph, it was reasoned that Resnikoff's disclosure of a "Poisson disc process" is a distribution schema which can be applied to two-dimensional sampling techniques. It was reasoned that Resnikoff does not teach that the schema is "predictable deterministic" as we have claimed.

It was reasoned that Balph's teaching of a non-linear counter based on a set of feedback shift registers was such a predictable deterministic schema, and it was postulated that Balph's disclosed object of reducing logic would have been the motivation by one of ordinary skill in the to replace Resnikoff's Poisson disc process with Balph's non-linear counter. Appellant respectfully disagrees.

References Are Not In Same Field of Endeavor. It was reasoned in the rejections that Balph and Resnikoff's invention belong to the same field of endeavor. Balph's non-linear counter is a deterministic process, while Resnikoff's Poisson disc process is a probabilistic process (e.g. Poisson distribution is well known in the art of probability and statistics). No citation has been made by examiner from Resnikoff wherein Resnikoff suggests replacing their probabilistic function with a deterministic function. Resnikoff does disclose a look up table, but one in which the data points are generated using a probabilistic function, and thus the schema using the table generates sensor positioning which is related to probability, not determinism.

No Suggestion or Motivation Found; Misinterpretation of Balph's Object. A question that remains is whether or not Balph provides the motivation to combine as proposed in the rationale for the rejection. Balph's invention is directed toward "binary counters":

Viktors Berstis

Page 4 of 14

You can use linear-feedback shift registers (LFSRs) as alternatives to conventional bi-nary counters (Reference 1). (Balph, page 1, col. 1, first line, emphasis added)

This is the extent of suggestion by Balph, to use LFSRs in place of binary counters. The next sentence in Balph's disclosure has been argued to provide the motivation to use Balph's alternative to binary counters in place of Resnikoff's Poisson probability schema:

> An LFSR reduces the amount of required logic and minimizes routing complexity. (Balph, page 1, col. 1, second sentence, emphasis added)

Balph's suggestion regarding logic minimization at this point in the reference applies to minimizing the logic of traditional binary counter designs. There is no suggestion or reason to believe that Balph is stating that use of an LFSR would decrease the logic complexity of a look up table or Poisson probability function. In fact, Balph's disclosure is silent as to application of LFSR's to probabilistic applications, and certainly Balph's remaining disclosure is non-enabling for that purpose.

Balph suggests that their LFSR can also be used as a pseudo-random number generator, but this is a well known use which we have also noted in our disclosure, although we referred to such a logical structure as a CRC polynomial:

> These generators find common use for pseudorandom-number generation. (Balph, pg. 1, col. 1, fifth sentence, emphasis added).

Balph's counter alternative produces number in a sequential manner in which no number is repeated twice until each and every other possible number has been produced in sequence, as any good counter circuit should do:

> Through simulation, you can observe the count sequence and verify that the selected polynomial repeats after 2n-1 states ... and that no state repeats within each sequence. (Balph, col. 3, lines 12 -15).

Viktors Berstis

Page 5 of 14

This type of even distribution of numbers in a sequence is known as a "uniform" distribution:

uniform distribution (continuous)

In mathematics, the continuous uniform distributions are probability distributions such that all intervals of the same length are equally probable. ...

uniform distribution (discrete)

In probability theory and statistics, the discrete uniform distribution is a discrete probability distribution that can be characterized by saying that all values of a finite set of possible values are equally probable. ...

(Source: www.wikipedia.com)

However, Resnikoff specifies use of a pseudo-random generator which produces numbers with a Poisson distribution:

... The term "pseudo-random" is used because, while the distribution of the sensor elements in the array is random, the distribution is arrived at by using specific algorithms to be disclosed hereinafter. In this description, the terms "pseudo-random" and "random" are used interchangeably. ... (Resnikoff, col. 4, lines 26 - 31, emphasis added)

A method of manufacturing the sensing device of this invention comprises the steps of randomly generating a series of numbers corresponding to the coordinates of points on the substrate relative to a fixed position until the number of points corresponds to a desired sampling rate. The barycenter of each sensor element is then located at one of these points, and the areas of the sensor elements selected to provide isolation of each element from its adjacent elements. To provide uniform response, the areas of the sensor elements must be substantially equal to each other. This method produces an array of sensors on the substrate <a href="https://papersor.org/har-numberso

Viktors Berstis

Page 6 of 14

Hence, Resnikoff's "specific algorithm" involves use of the "barycenter" of the sensors, and achieves a Poisson distribution. There are known in the art pseudo-random generator processes which achieve other distributions, such as Uniform, Gaussian, Exponential, LaPlace, Weibull, Cauchy, Raleigh, Lognormal, Gumbel, Bernoulli, Geometric, Binomial, etc., but Resnikoff specifies Poisson.

As Balph is silent as to the use or adaption of their counter circuit for use in generating random numbers having a Poisson distribution, and as Resnikoff clearly specifies use of a random Poisson schema, there can be no motivation to combine the references as proposed in the rationale for the rejections for the following reasons:

- (a) uniform and Poisson distributions are not the same;
- replacing Resnikoff's Poisson distribution function with a uniform (b) distribution function may render Resnikoff undesirable for it's intended function;
- Resnikoff in view of Balph fails to teachs all of our claimed steps, (c) elements, and limitations.

Confusion should be avoided when considering when and how the terms uniform and non-uniform are used in our disclosure and in the references. In one use, the term is being used to describe the distribution of numbers, such as our CRC process and Balph's counter, which generate random numbers with a uniform distribution. We then use these numbers as offsets from uniformly spaced points on a physical row for the placement of sensors, thus giving us an array of sensors having non-uniform spacing (e.g. randomized), but in which the offset values from uniform points on the array are uniformly distributed.

Resnikoff, however, applies a Poisson (e.g. non-uniform) distribution function to achieve a physical sensor row having a randomized positioning arrangement, but their underlying offset values from uniformly spaced points on the array will have a Poisson distribution, not a uniform distribution.

For these reasons, Appellant requests reversal of the rejections of claims 1 - 4, 6 - 9, 10, 12 - 17, and 19 - 21.

→ USPTO FAX SRVR

[2] 009

Serial No. 10/015,492

Viktors Berstis

Page 7 of 14

Summary of Arguments

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the rejections of Claims 1 - 19 were erroneous, and Appellant requests reversal of the rejections.

Respectfully Submitted,

Robert Frantz

Agent for Appellant(s)

Robert H. Frantz, Reg. No. 42,553

Tel: (405) 812-5613

Franklin Gray Patents, LLC P.O. Box 23324 Oklahoma City, OK 73127

Tel: 405-812-5613 Fax: 405-440-2465 Viktors Berstis

Page 8 of 14

Claims Appendix per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(viii)

Clean Form of Amended Claims

Claim 1 (previously amended):

A method of producing a two-dimensional sensor array for imaging, comprising the steps of:

determining a plurality of sensor positions, each position having a spacing in a first axis from a datum point according to a first non-uniform predictable deterministic distribution schema, and each position having a spacing in a second axis from said datum point according to a second predictable deterministic non-uniform distribution schema;

providing a two-dimensional array of sensors, each sensor being positioned on said array according to the determined positions in said first and second axes; and

providing a means for sampling said sensors such that a two-dimensional imaging sensor array having non-uniform sensor distribution is realized.

Claim 2 (original):

The method as set forth in Claim 1 wherein said first schema comprises a pseudo-random schema.

Claim 3 (original):

The method as set forth in Claim 1 wherein said first schema comprises a nonlinear polynomial schema.

Claim 4 (original):

The method as set forth in Claim 1 further comprising the step of assigning one or more reference identifiers to said first and second non-uniform distribution schema.

Viktors Berstis

Page 9 of 14

Claim 5 (original):

The method as set forth in Claim 1 wherein said second schema comprises a pseudo-random schema.

Claim 6 (original):

The method as set forth in Claim 1 wherein said second schema comprises a nonlinear polynomial schema.

Claim 7 (previously amended):

The method as set forth in Claim 1 further comprising the steps of:

creating a dithered set of data samples by sampling said non-uniformly spaced sensors, said dithered set of data samples representing an image; and

performing interpolation to synthesize a set of data samples representing uniformly spaced data samples from said dithered set of data samples, said uniformly spaced data samples representing said image according to uniformly distributed sensors.

Claim 8 (original):

The method as set forth in Claim 7 wherein said step of performing interpolation to synthesize a set of data samples representing uniformly spaced data samples comprises performing linear interpolation.

Viktors Berstis

Page 10 of 14

Claim 9 (previously amended):

A computer readable medium encoded with software for creating a synthesized uniformly-spaced data set from a dithered data set in an imaging system, said software performing the steps of:

receiving a dithered set of data samples, said dithered set of data samples representing an image sampled by a plurality of sensors, wherein said sensors are positioned positions with a spacing in a first axis from a datum point according to a first non-uniform predictable deterministic distribution schema, and each sensor having a position spacing in a second axis from said datum point according to a second predictable deterministic non-uniform distribution schema; and

performing interpolation to synthesize a set of data samples representing uniformly spaced data samples from said dithered set of data samples, said uniformly spaced data samples representing said image according to uniformly distributed sensors.

Claim 10 (original):

The computer readable medium as set forth in Claim 9 wherein said software for performing interpolation comprises software for performing linear interpolation.

Claim 11 (original):

The computer readable medium as set forth in Claim 9 further comprising software for performing the step of receiving a reference identifier associated with distribution schema

of said dithered data set, and wherein said software for performing interpolation comprises software for performing interpolation based upon said distribution schema.

Viktors Berstis

Page 11 of 14

Claim 12 (previously amended):

A digital imaging system comprising:

a sensor array means, said sensor array having a set of sensors arranged in first axis in a non-uniform predictable deterministic manner according to a first schema and in a second axis in a non-uniform predictable deterministic manner according to a second schema:

a sampling means for sampling said sensors; and

a dithered data set creation means for storing data samples from said sampling means.

Claim 13 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 12 wherein said sensors of said sensor array means are arranged in said first axis according to a pseudo-random schema.

Claim 14 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 12 wherein said sensors of said sensor array means are arranged in said first axis according to a nonlinear polynomial schema.

Claim 15 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 12 wherein said sensors of said sensor array means are arranged in said second axis according to a pseudo-random schema.

Claim 16 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 12 wherein said sensors of said sensor array means are arranged in said second axis according to a polynomial schema.

Viktors Berstis

Page 12 of 14

Claim 17 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 12 further comprising an interpolation means for synthesizing a uniformly-spaced data sample set from said dithered data sample set.

Claim 18 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 18 wherein said interpolation means comprises a linear interpolation means.

Claim 19 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 18 further comprising a means for receiving an reference identifier associated with said first and second distribution schema and selecting an interpolation means according to said first and second distribution schema.

Viktors Berstis

Page 13 of 14

Evidence Appendix per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(ix)

No evidence has been submitted by applicant or examiner pursuant to 37 CFR §§1.130, 1.131, or 1.132.

→ USPTO FAX SRVR

2016

Serial No. 10/015,492

Viktors Berstis

Page 14 of 14

Related Proceedings Appendix per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(x)

No decisions have been rendered by a court or the Board in the related proceedings as identified under 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(ii).

FRANKLIN GRAY PATENTS, LLC

ROBERT H. FRANTZ, REGISTERED US PATENT AGENT

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

OCT 1 2 2005

U.S. GAU	niner Sathyanaraya V. Perunga Patent and Trademark Office 2635 571-273-8300 (Central Fax Ser		FROM:	Robert H. Frantz Franklin Gray Patents, LLC Tel: 405-812-5613 Fax: 405-440-2465
DATE:	October 12, 2005			
PAGES:	16 (inclusive)			
In re the App	olication of:			
Viktors Ber	estis)		
Serial Num	ber: 10/015,492)		Group: 2625
Docket Nur	nber: AUS920011012US1)	Examiner:	Sathyanaraya V. Perungavoor
Filed on: 12	2/13/2001)		
	m and Method for Anti-Moiré a Two Dimensional Sensor)		

Certificate of Transmission unde	r 37	CFR	\$1.8
----------------------------------	------	-----	-------

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on:

DATE: Uct. 12,2005

Аттау"

SIGNATURE: Kobert Trantz

RECEIVED OIPE/IAP

OCT 1 3 2005

Robert H. Frantz, Reg. No. 42,553

NOTICE:

The information contained in this facsimile transmission is confidential. If you have received this transmission in error, please contact the sender immediately and destroy your copy.

→ USPTO FAX SRVR

(Modified) PTO/SB/17 (12-04v2)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006, OMB 0851-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE to a collection of information unless it displays a valid,OMB_control number.

					ľ		Con	npiete if Kn	OWN		115	EIVED	
							10/01	.		CEN	TRAL	FAX CENTE	
F		RANSMI'			Application Number		12/13/20						
	fo	r FY 200	5		Filing Date			Berstis			OCT 1 2 2005		
Effective 12/0	08/2004. Po	stent fees ere subje	ct to annual	revision.	First Name	d Inventor			\				
					Examiner I	Name		naraya	V. I	Perung	avoo	1	
☐ Applicant clai	ms small	entity status. S	ee 37 CFI	R 1.27	Art Unit		2625	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		·			
TOTAL AMOUN	T OF PA	YMENT (") \$ 500.0	0	Attorney D	ocket No.	AUS92	2001101	<u> 2U</u>	<u>S1</u>			
				METHOD C	F PAYMEN	(check all th	et apply)						
☐ Check ☐	Credit o	ard 🗆 Money	Order	□ None □	Other (plea	se identify	v):						
□ Deposit Ac □ Deposit Ac	count:												
Deposit A	ccount N	lumber: <u>09-0</u>	447 [Deposit Accou	unt Name:	IBM Co	rporation						
The Director i ☑ Charge fee ☑ Charge any under 37 ((s) indica addition	ated below			ю(s)		rge fee(s) in dit any overp		low,	except f	or the	filing fee	
1. BASIC FILIN	G, SEAR	CH, AND EXAM	MINATION	FEES									
FEE CALCULAT	IION												
		FILING FEE	S Entity	SI	EARCH FEE Sma	S II Entity	EX	AMINATION Sir		E8 Intity			
Application Typ	e F		e (\$)	Fee		ee (\$)	Fee		Fee	. •	Fee	s Paid (\$)	
Utility			50	500		250	200		100				
Design			00	100 300		50 150	130 160		69 80	_			
Plant Reissue			00 50	500		250	600		300	_			
Provisional			00	0		0	0		(0			
2. EXCESS CLA	IM FEES								_		Sm	all Entity	
FEE DESCRIPT	IAN												
FEE DESCRIPT	IUŅ									9 (\$)		Fee (\$)	
Each claim ov		for reissues, ea	ch claim o	ver 20 and mo	re than in the	original pa	tent		5	50		25	
● Each claim ov	er 20 or,							tent	5				
Each claim ov Each indepen	er 20 or, dent clair	n over 3 or, for f						tent	20	50		25	
Each claim ov Each Indepen Multiple deper	er 20 or, dent clair	n over 3 or, for f	Reissues,	each independ	ent claim mo	ore than in t	he original pa		20 36	50 00 30	Work on the	25 100 180	
Each claim ov Each indepen	er 20 or, dent clair ndent clai	n over 3 or, for f		each independ	ent claim mo		he original pa	tent e Paid (\$)	20 36	50 00 60	The second second	25 100	
Each claim ov Each Indepen Multiple deper Total Claims	rer 20 or, dent clair ndent clair	n over 3 or, for f ms 20 or HP=	Reissues, Extra Cl	each independ	ent claim mo	ee(\$)	he original par		36	50 50 60 60 10 tt ple	The second second	25 100 180 Jent Cklims	
 Each claim ov Each indepen Multiple deper Total Claims HP = highest nu. 	rer 20 or, dent clair ndent clair	n over 3 or, for f ms 20 or HP=	Reissues, Extra Cl	each independ aims ;	ent claim mo	ee(\$)	he original par	e Paid (\$)	36	50 00 60	The second second	25 100 180 Jent Cklims	
Each claim ov Each Indepen Multiple deper Total Claims	dent clair ndent clair - 2	n over 3 or, for firms 20 or HP= otal claims paid	Reissues, Extra Cl	each independ aims ter than 20 aims	ent claim mo	ee(\$)	he original par		36	50 50 60 60 10 tt ple	The second second	25 100 180 Jent Cklims	
 Each claim ov Each Indepen Multiple deper Total Claims HP = highest num Indep. Claims 	dent clair ndent clair - 2 mber of to	n over 3 or, for firms 20 or HP= otal claims paid 3 or HP=	Extra Classifor, if great Extra Classification	each independ	ent claim mo	ee(\$) 50	he original par	e Paid (\$)	36	50 50 60 60 10 tt ple	The second second	25 100 180 Jent Cklims	
 Each claim ov Each indepen Multiple deper Total Claims HP = highest num Indep. Claims 	mber of to	n over 3 or, for firms 20 or HP= otal claims paid 3 or HP= otal claims paid	Extra Classifor, if great Extra Classification	each independ	ent claim mo	ee(\$) 50	he original par	e Paid (\$)	36	50 50 60 60 10 tt ple	The second second	25 100 180 Jent Cklims	
Each claim ov Each Indepen Multiple deper Total Claims HP = highest nu Indep. Claims HP = highest nu 3. APPLICATIO If the specification	mber of to N SIZE For and drawn and	n over 3 or, for firms 20 or HP= otal claims paid 3 or HP= otal claims paid EE awings exceed 1	Extra Clifor, if greaters	each independ aims ster than 20 aims ster than 3	FX	ee(\$) 50 ee(\$) 200	Fe =	e Paid (\$)	36	50 50 60 60 728 (\$) 380 x		25 100 180 Jent Ckalms 96 Paid (\$)	
Each claim ov Each Indepen Multiple deper Total Claims HP = highest number. Claims HP = highest number. 3. APPLICATIO If the specification 35 U.S.C. 41 (a)	mber of to N SIZE For and drawn and	n over 3 or, for firms 20 or HP= otal claims paid 3 or HP= otal claims paid EE awings exceed 1 d 37 CFR 1.16	Extra Clifor, if greaters	each independ aims iter than 20 aims iter than 3	FX FAX	ee(\$) 50 ee(\$) 200	Fe =	e Pald (\$) e Pald (\$)	36	50 50 60 60 728 (\$) 380 x	fraction	25 100 180 Jent Ckalms 96 Paid (\$)	
Each claim ov Each Indepen Multiple deper Total Claims HP = highest nu Indep. Claims HP = highest nu 3. APPLICATIO If the specification	mber of to N SIZE For and drawn and	n over 3 or, for firms 20 or HP= otal claims paid 3 or HP= otal claims paid EE awings exceed 1	Extra Clifor, if greaters	each independ aims iter than 20 aims iter than 3	FX FAX	ee(\$) 50 ee(\$) 200	Fe =	e Pald (\$) e Pald (\$)	20 36	nutspec Pae (\$) 360 x sheets or	fraction	25 100 180 Isnt Ctalms reg Pa d (\$1)	
Each claim ov Each Indepen Multiple deper Total Claims HP = highest number. Claims HP = highest number. 3. APPLICATIO If the specification 35 U.S.C. 41 (a)	mber of to N SIZE For and drawn and	n over 3 or, for firms 20 or HP= otal claims paid 3 or HP= otal claims paid EE awings exceed 1 d 37 CFR 1.16	Extra Clifor, if greaters	each independ aims iter than 20 aims iter than 3 s of paper, the	FX FAX	ee(\$) 50 ee(\$) 200 lize fee due	Fe =	e Pald (\$) e Pald (\$)	36	nutspe nutspe Pag (s) 380 x	fraction	25 100 180 Isnt Ctalms reg Pa d (\$1)	
● Each claim ov ● Each Indepen ● Multiple deper Total Claims HP = highest nu Indep. Claims HP = highest nu 3. APPLICATIO If the specification 35 U.S.C. 41 (a) Total Sheets 4. OTHER FEE	mber of to N SIZE F SI AND A CONTROL TO BE TO	n over 3 or, for firms 20 or HP= otal claims paid 3 or HP= otal claims paid EE awings exceed 1 ad 37 CFR 1.16(Extra Sheets	Extra Clifor, if greaters Clifor, if greaters Clifor, if greaters Clifor, if greaters St.	each independ aims iter than 20 aims iter than 3 s of paper, the	FX FAX application s	ee(\$) 50 ee(\$) 200 lize fee due	Fe =	e Pald (\$) e Pald (\$)	20 36	nutspec Pae (\$) 360 x sheets or	fraction	25 100 180 Isnt Ctalms reg Pa d (\$1)	
● Each claim ov ● Each Indepen ● Multiple deper Total Claims HP = highest nu Indep. Claims HP = highest nu 3. APPLICATIO If the specification 35 U.S.C. 41 (a) Total Sheets 4. OTHER FEE	mber of to mber of to N SIZE F n and dra 100 = (S) h Specific	n over 3 or, for firms 20 or HP= otal claims paid 3 or HP= otal claims paid EE awings exceed 1 d 37 CFR 1.16	Extra Clifor, if greater Clifor Sheets	each independ aims Iter than 20 aims Iter than 3 Iter than 3 Iter than 3	FX FX application s of each add	ee(\$) 50 ee(\$) 200 lize fee due	Fe =	e Pald (\$) e Pald (\$)	20 36	nutspec Pae (\$) 360 x sheets or	fraction	25 100 180 fent Ctalms on Paid (\$) thereof. See Fee Paid (\$)	
Each claim ov Each indepen Multiple deper Total Claims HP = highest num Indep. Claims HP = highest num 3. APPLICATIO If the specification 35 U.S.C. 41 (a) Total Sheets 4. OTHER FEE Non-Englis Other:	mber of to N SIZE F SI AND	n over 3 or, for firms 20 or HP= otal claims paid 3 or HP= otal claims paid EE awings exceed 1 ad 37 CFR 1.16(Extra Sheets	Extra Clifor, if greater Clifor Sheets	each independ aims Iter than 20 aims Iter than 3 Iter than 3 Iter than 3	FX FX application s of each add	ee(\$) 50 ee(\$) 200 lize fee due	Fe =	e Pald (\$) e Pald (\$)	20 36	nutspec Pae (\$) 360 x sheets or	fraction	25 100 180 ignt Ctalms sea Pald (\$) thereof. See Fee Paid (\$)	
Each claim ov Each Indepen Multiple depen Total Claims HP = highest num Indep. Claims HP = highest num 3. APPLICATIO If the specification 35 U.S.C. 41 (a) Total Sheets 4. OTHER FEE Non-Englis Other: SUBMITTED BY	mber of to mber of to n SIZE For and dr. 91)(G) ar (S) h Specific	n over 3 or, for firms 20 or HP= otal claims paid 3 or HP= otal claims paid EE avings exceed 1 d 37 CFR 1.16(Extra Sheets	Extra Clifor, if greatesta Cli	each independ aims iter than 20 aims iter than 3 s of paper, the independent Number	FX Application s of each add (round up to	ee(\$) 50 ee(\$) 200 ize fee due litional 50 d	Fe =	e Paid (\$) e Paid (\$) ach addition	36 36 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38	500 500 500 500 286 (\$11 360 x sheets or Fee(\$)	fraction	25 100 180 Int Ctalms GaPa d (\$) thereof. See Fee Paid (\$) es Paid (\$)	
Each claim ov Each indepen Multiple deper Total Claims HP = highest num Indep. Claims HP = highest num 3. APPLICATIO If the specification 35 U.S.C. 41 (a) Total Sheets 4. OTHER FEE	mber of to mber of to mber of to n size Fee f	n over 3 or, for firms 20 or HP= otal claims paid 3 or HP= otal claims paid EE awings exceed 1 ad 37 CFR 1.16(Extra Sheets	Extra Clifor, if great Extra Clifor, if great 100 sheets).	each independ aims iter than 20 alms iter than 3 s of paper, the aims Number Registra	FX Application s of each add (round up to	ee(\$) 50 ee(\$) 200 lize fee due	Fe =	e Pald (\$) e Pald (\$)	36 36 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38 38	500 500 500 500 286 (\$11 360 x sheets or Fee(\$)	fraction	25 100 180 Int Ctalms GaPa d (\$) thereof. See Fee Paid (\$) es Paid (\$)	

RECEIVED

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

Franklin Gray Patents

In re the Application of:		CENTRAL FAX CENTER
Viktors Berstis)	OCT 1 2 2005
Serial Number: 10/015,492)	Group: 2625
Docket Number: AUS920011012US1)	Examiner: Sathyanaraya V. Perungavoor
Filed on: 12/13/2001)	
For: "System and Method for Anti-Moiré)	•
Imaging in a Two Dimensional Sensor)	
Array")	

APPEAL BRIEF

Real Party in Interest per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(i)

The subject patent application is owned by International Business Machines Corporation of Armonk, NY.

Related Appeals and Interferences per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(ii)

The present patent application is related to US Patent Application number 10/015,880, docket number AUS920011011US1, which is under appeal from final rejections. No decision from a court or the Board has been rendered in this related appeal.

Status of Claims per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(iii)

Claims 1 - 19 were finally rejected in the Examiner's decision of May 16, 2005. Claims 1, 7, 9, and 12 were amended on February 3, 2005. Claims originally filed numbered as 16 - 20 were renumbered to 15-19 by the examiner, as no claim number 15 was originally presented.

The rejections of Claims 1 - 19 were appealed by Appellant on September 16, 2006.

Status of Amendments after Final Rejections per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(iv)

No amendments to the claims have been submitted or entered after final rejections.

10/13/2005 EAREGAY1 00000025 090447 10015492

01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

Viktors Berstis

Page 2 of 14

Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(v)

The invention relates to devices and methods for producing sampled images, such as digital or digitized images, in a manner to avoid producing Moiré patterns. A two-dimensional sensor array is provided which has non-uniformly spaced sensors such that it avoids production of an inherent "frequency" that may interfere or resonate with details or harmonics present in the image source. The sensors are disposed in the a two-dimensional, non-uniform pattern according to a predetermined scheme or function. An image is captured using the non-uniformly placed sensors, and optionally, linear interpolation is applied to the non-uniformly spaced data set to yield a synthesized uniformly-spaced data set for use in common imaging formats and processing, such as JPEG or MPEG compression and decompression.

More specifically, we have claimed method, computer-readable medium and system embodiments of the invention in independent claims 1, 9, and 12, respectively, as follows:

- determining a plurality of sensor positions having a position-to-position spacing (a) in a first axis (pg. 11, lines 11 - 17) from a datum point according to a first non-uniform predictable deterministic distribution schema (pg. 12 line 6 - pg. 13 line 2), and each position having a spacing in a second axis (pg. 11, lines 20 - 22) from the datum point according to a second predictable deterministic non-uniform distribution schema (pg. 12 line 6 - pg. 13 line 2);
- providing a two-dimensional array of sensors, each sensor being positioned on (b) the array according to the determined positions in said first and second axes (pg. 17 lines 1 - 7, pg. 14 lines 10 - 19); and
- providing a means for sampling (pg. 10 lines 9 11, pg. 17 lines 8 9) said (c) sensors such that a two-dimensional imaging sensor array having non-uniform sensor distribution is realized.

An advantage to our invention is that the use of a predictable deterministic function to calculate the position of a sensor in one or two axes allows for an image data set (e.g. the actual data samples in a JPEG or bitmap file) to be properly interpreted by a recipient without the need for any look up tables (pg. 12 lines 10 - 13) to be associated with the image or complicated image processing functions, only requiring the knowledge of the actual distribution function parameters and a seed value (e.g. CRC parameters and values) (pg. 12 line 21 - pg. 13 line 2).

Viktors Berstis

Page 3 of 14

Grounds for Rejection For Which Review is Sought per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(vi)

Appellant requests review by the Board of the rejections of claims 1 - 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 4,574,311 to Resnikoff, *et al.* (hereinafter "Resnikoff") in view of publication "Lfsr Counters Implement Binary Polynomial Generators" by Balph (hereinafter "Balph").

Arguments per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(vii)

Rejections of Claims 1 - 19 over Resnikoff in View of Balph

In the rationale for the final rejections of Claims 1 - 4, 6 - 9, 10, 12 - 17, and 19 - 21 Resnikoff in view of Balph, it was reasoned that Resnikoff's disclosure of a "Poisson disc process" is a distribution schema which can be applied to two-dimensional sampling techniques. It was reasoned that Resnikoff does not teach that the schema is "predictable deterministic" as we have claimed.

It was reasoned that Balph's teaching of a non-linear counter based on a set of feedback shift registers was such a predictable deterministic schema, and it was postulated that Balph's disclosed object of reducing logic would have been the motivation by one of ordinary skill in the to replace Resnikoff's Poisson disc process with Balph's non-linear counter. Appellant respectfully disagrees.

References Are Not In Same Field of Endeavor. It was reasoned in the rejections that Balph and Resnikoff's invention belong to the same field of endeavor. Balph's non-linear counter is a deterministic process, while Resnikoff's Poisson disc process is a probabilistic process (e.g. Poisson distribution is well known in the art of probability and statistics). No citation has been made by examiner from Resnikoff wherein Resnikoff suggests replacing their probabilistic function with a deterministic function. Resnikoff does disclose a look up table, but one in which the data points are generated using a probabilistic function, and thus the schema using the table generates sensor positioning which is related to probability, not determinism.

No Suggestion or Motivation Found; Misinterpretation of Balph's Object. A question that remains is whether or not Balph provides the motivation to combine as proposed in the rationale for the rejection. Balph's invention is directed toward "binary counters":

Viktors Berstis

Page 4 of 14

You can use linear-feedback shift registers (LFSRs) <u>as alternatives to conventional bi-nary counters</u> (Reference 1). (Balph, page 1, col. 1, first line, emphasis added)

This is the extent of suggestion by Balph, to use LFSRs in place of binary counters. The next sentence in Balph's disclosure has been argued to provide the motivation to use Balph's alternative to binary counters in place of Resnikoff's Poisson probability schema:

An LFSR reduces the amount of required logic and minimizes routing complexity. (Balph, page 1, col. 1, second sentence, emphasis added)

Balph's suggestion regarding logic minimization at this point in the reference applies to minimizing the logic of *traditional binary counter designs*. There is no suggestion or reason to believe that Balph is stating that use of an LFSR would decrease the logic complexity of a look up table or Poisson probability function. In fact, Balph's disclosure is silent as to application of LFSR's to probabilistic applications, and certainly Balph's remaining disclosure is non-enabling for that purpose.

Balph suggests that their LFSR can also be used as a pseudo-random number generator, but this is a well known use which we have also noted in our disclosure, although we referred to such a logical structure as a CRC polynomial:

These generators find <u>common use</u> for pseudorandom-number generation. (Balph, pg. 1, col. 1, fifth sentence, emphasis added).

Balph's counter alternative produces number in a sequential manner in which no number is repeated twice until each and every other possible number has been produced in sequence, as any good counter circuit should do:

Through simulation, you can observe the count sequence and verify that the selected polynomial repeats after 2n-1 states ... and that no state repeats within each sequence. (Balph, col. 3, lines 12 -15).

Viktors Berstis

Page 5 of 14

This type of even distribution of numbers in a sequence is known as a "uniform" distribution:

uniform distribution (continuous)

In mathematics, the continuous uniform distributions are probability distributions such that all intervals of the same length are equally probable. ...

uniform distribution (discrete)

In probability theory and statistics, the discrete uniform distribution is a discrete probability distribution that can be characterized by saying that all values of a finite set of possible values are equally probable. ...

(Source: www.wikipedia.com)

However, Resnikoff specifies use of a pseudo-random generator which produces numbers with a Poisson distribution:

... The term "pseudo-random" is used because, while the distribution of the sensor elements in the array is random, the distribution is arrived at by using specific algorithms to be disclosed hereinafter. In this description, the terms "pseudo-random" and "random" are used interchangeably. ... (Resnikoff, col. 4, lines 26 - 31, emphasis added)

A method of manufacturing the sensing device of this invention comprises the steps of randomly generating a series of numbers corresponding to the coordinates of points on the substrate relative to a fixed position until the number of points corresponds to a desired sampling rate. The barycenter of each sensor element is then located at one of these points, and the areas of the sensor elements selected to provide isolation of each element from its adjacent elements. To provide uniform response, the areas of the sensor elements must be substantially equal to each other. This method produces an array of sensors on the substrate <a href="https://paperson.org/har-new-marked-nature-na

Viktors Berstis

Page 6 of 14

Hence, Resnikoff's "specific algorithm" involves use of the "barycenter" of the sensors, and achieves a *Poisson* distribution. There are known in the art pseudo-random generator processes which achieve other distributions, such as Uniform, Gaussian, Exponential, LaPlace, Weibull, Cauchy, Raleigh, Lognormal, Gumbel, Bernoulli, Geometric, Binomial, etc., but Resnikoff specifies Poisson.

As Balph is silent as to the use or adaption of their counter circuit for use in generating random numbers having a Poisson distribution, and as Resnikoff clearly specifies use of a random Poisson schema, there can be no motivation to combine the references as proposed in the rationale for the rejections for the following reasons:

- (a) uniform and Poisson distributions are not the same;
- replacing Resnikoff's Poisson distribution function with a uniform distribution function may render Resnikoff undesirable for it's intended function;
- (c) Resnikoff in view of Balph fails to teachs all of our claimed steps, elements, and limitations.

Confusion should be avoided when considering when and how the terms uniform and non-uniform are used in our disclosure and in the references. In one use, the term is being used to describe the distribution of numbers, such as our CRC process and Balph's counter, which generate random numbers with a uniform distribution. We then use these numbers as offsets from uniformly spaced points on a physical row for the placement of sensors, thus giving us an array of sensors having non-uniform spacing (e.g. randomized), but in which the offset values from uniform points on the array are uniformly distributed.

Resnikoff, however, applies a Poisson (e.g. non-uniform) distribution function to achieve a physical sensor row having a randomized positioning arrangement, but their underlying offset values from uniformly spaced points on the array will have a Poisson distribution, not a uniform distribution.

For these reasons, Appellant requests reversal of the rejections of claims 1 - 4, 6 - 9, 10, 12 - 17, and 19 - 21.

Viktors Berstis

Page 7 of 14

Summary of Arguments

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the rejections of Claims 1 - 19 were erroneous, and Appellant requests reversal of the rejections.

Respectfully Submitted,

Agent for Appellant(s)

Robert H. Frantz, Reg. No. 42,553

Tel: (405) 812-5613

Franklin Gray Patents, LLC P.O. Box 23324 Oklahoma City, OK 73127

Tel: 405-812-5613 Fax: 405-440-2465

Viktors Berstis

Page 8 of 14

Claims Appendix per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(viii)

Clean Form of Amended Claims

Claim 1 (previously amended):

A method of producing a two-dimensional sensor array for imaging, comprising the steps of:

determining a plurality of sensor positions, each position having a spacing in a first axis from a datum point according to a first non-uniform predictable deterministic distribution schema, and each position having a spacing in a second axis from said datum point according to a second predictable deterministic non-uniform distribution schema;

providing a two-dimensional array of sensors, each sensor being positioned on said array according to the determined positions in said first and second axes; and

providing a means for sampling said sensors such that a two-dimensional imaging sensor array having non-uniform sensor distribution is realized.

Claim 2 (original):

The method as set forth in Claim 1 wherein said first schema comprises a pseudo-random schema.

Claim 3 (original):

The method as set forth in Claim 1 wherein said first schema comprises a nonlinear polynomial schema.

Claim 4 (original):

The method as set forth in Claim 1 further comprising the step of assigning one or more reference identifiers to said first and second non-uniform distribution schema.

Viktors Berstis

Page 9 of 14

Claim 5 (original):

The method as set forth in Claim 1 wherein said second schema comprises a pseudo-random schema.

Claim 6 (original):

The method as set forth in Claim 1 wherein said second schema comprises a nonlinear polynomial schema.

Claim 7 (previously amended):

The method as set forth in Claim 1 further comprising the steps of:

creating a dithered set of data samples by sampling said non-uniformly spaced sensors, said dithered set of data samples representing an image; and

performing interpolation to synthesize a set of data samples representing uniformly spaced data samples from said dithered set of data samples, said uniformly spaced data samples representing said image according to uniformly distributed sensors.

Claim 8 (original):

The method as set forth in Claim 7 wherein said step of performing interpolation to synthesize a set of data samples representing uniformly spaced data samples comprises performing linear interpolation.

Viktors Berstis

Page 10 of 14

Claim 9 (previously amended):

A computer readable medium encoded with software for creating a synthesized uniformly-spaced data set from a dithered data set in an imaging system, said software performing the steps of:

receiving a dithered set of data samples, said dithered set of data samples representing an image sampled by a plurality of sensors, wherein said sensors are positioned positions with a spacing in a first axis from a datum point according to a first non-uniform predictable deterministic distribution schema, and each sensor having a position spacing in a second axis from said datum point according to a second predictable deterministic non-uniform distribution schema; and

performing interpolation to synthesize a set of data samples representing uniformly spaced data samples from said dithered set of data samples, said uniformly spaced data samples representing said image according to uniformly distributed sensors.

Claim 10 (original):

The computer readable medium as set forth in Claim 9 wherein said software for performing interpolation comprises software for performing linear interpolation.

Claim 11 (original):

The computer readable medium as set forth in Claim 9 further comprising software for performing the step of receiving a reference identifier associated with distribution

schema

of said dithered data set, and wherein said software for performing interpolation comprises software for performing interpolation based upon said distribution schema.

Viktors Berstis

Page 11 of 14

Claim 12 (previously amended):

A digital imaging system comprising:

a sensor array means, said sensor array having a set of sensors arranged in first axis in a non-uniform predictable deterministic manner according to a first schema and in a second axis in a non-uniform predictable deterministic manner according to a second schema;

a sampling means for sampling said sensors; and

a dithered data set creation means for storing data samples from said sampling means.

Claim 13 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 12 wherein said sensors of said sensor array means are arranged in said first axis according to a pseudo-random schema.

Claim 14 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 12 wherein said sensors of said sensor array means are arranged in said first axis according to a nonlinear polynomial schema.

Claim 15 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 12 wherein said sensors of said sensor array means are arranged in said second axis according to a pseudo-random schema.

Claim 16 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 12 wherein said sensors of said sensor array means are arranged in said second axis according to a polynomial schema.

Viktors Berstis

Page 12 of 14

Claim 17 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 12 further comprising an interpolation means for synthesizing a uniformly-spaced data sample set from said dithered data sample set.

Claim 18 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 18 wherein said interpolation means comprises a linear interpolation means.

Claim 19 (original):

The digital imaging system as set forth in Claim 18 further comprising a means for receiving an reference identifier associated with said first and second distribution schema and selecting an interpolation means according to said first and second distribution schema.

Viktors Berstis

Page 13 of 14

Evidence Appendix per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(ix)

No evidence has been submitted by applicant or examiner pursuant to 37 CFR §§1.130, 1.131, or 1.132.

Viktors Berstis

Page 14 of 14

Related Proceedings Appendix per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(x)

No decisions have been rendered by a court or the Board in the related proceedings as identified under 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(ii).

FRANKLIN GRAY PATENTS, LLC

ROBERT H. FRANTZ, REGISTERED US PATENT AGENT

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 1 2 2005

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

TO:	U.S. P GAU	ner Sathyanaraya V. Perunga atent and Trademark Office 2635 71-273-8300 (Central Fax Se		FROM:	Robert H. Frantz Franklin Gray Patents, LLC Tel: 405-812-5613 Fax: 405-440-2465
DATE	<u>:</u> :	October 12, 2005			Tel: 405-812-5613 Fax: 405-440-2465 Men Hing duly 550 67 Group: 2625 Sathyanaraya V. Perungavoor
PAGE	ES:	16 (inclusive)		1.7	answith frams
In re t	he Appl	ication of:		Re	2 V(1-6 V
Vikto	ors Bers	tis)	ko (<i>y.</i> ./.
Seria	l Numb	er: 10/015,492)	Oxe	Group: 2625
Dock	et Num	aber: AUS920011012US1)	Examiner	:: Sathyanaraya V. Perungavoor
Filed	on: 12/	/13/2001)		
For: 'Imag	"Systen	n and Method for Anti-Moiré Two Dimensional Sensor)		

Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR §1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on:

DATE: Uct. 12,2005

Array"

SIGNATURE: Kobert Trantz

Robert H. Frantz, Reg. No. 42,553

RECEIVED

OCT 1 3 2005

NOTICE:

The information contained in this facsimile transmission is confidential. If you have received this transmission in error, please contact the sender immediately and destroy your copy.

2002

(Modified) PTO/SB/17 (12-04/2)
Approved for use through 07/31/2008. OMB 0651-0032
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

		Ones: allo / aportion						Comp	elete if Kn	own			HEUEIVED	
	:EE 7	TRANSMI	Application Number 10/015				492		(CENTRAL FAX CENT				
r		or FY 200		Filing Date 12/13/20)1				OCT 1 2 2005			
				an dalam	First Named Inventor			Viktors Berstis				001 12 2003		
Effective 12/	©8/2004. `	Patent fees are subje	revision.	Examiner Name Sathyana			araya V. Perungavoor							
C Applicant cla	ime ema	ill entity status. S	See 37 CFI	R 1.27	Art Unit		1	2625						
			r) \$ 600.0			Attorney Docket No. AUS920011012US1						.;•		
TOTAL AMOU	NI OF P	ATMENT () \$ 600.0	METHOD C				ply)						
	Canadia	card	u Order	□ None □	Other (nle	ease ident	ifv)·				_			
			y Older	- None	Other (pie	ouse ident					_			
☑ Deposit A		Number: <u>09-0</u>	MA7 [Deposit Accor	unt Name:	IBM C	corno	ration						
The Director ⊠ Charge fee ⊠ Charge an	is auth e(s) indi v additi	orized to: (che	ck all the	t apply)		□ Ct	narge			low,	except f	or ti	ne filing fee	
1. BASIC FILIN		RCH, AND EXA	MINATION	FEES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·									
CEE CALCULA	TINI.	FILING FEE	s	Ś	EARCH FE	ES		EXA	MINATIO	N FEI	ES			
		Sma	ii Entity		Sm	all Entity		Fee		nalj E Fee	intity (\$)	F	ees Paid (\$)	
Application Ty	ре		99 (\$)	Fee	(\$)	Fee (\$) 250		200	(4)	10		•	000 i aia (4)	
Utililty Design		•••	150 100	500 100		50 50		130		6	5 _			
Plant		200	100	300		150		160 600		80 30	_			
Reissue Provisional			150 100	500 0		250 0		000			0 _			
	<u>IIQN</u> ver 20 o	ES r, for reissues, ea aim over 3 or, for		•					en t	20	e (\$) 50 00	S	mall Entity Fee (\$) 25 100	
Multiple depe	endent cl	laims								30	50 	inava		
Total Claims			Extra Cl			Fee(\$)		Fee	Paid (\$)	100	William Committee of the committee of	Dep	indencClaims	
		- 20 or HP=	<u> </u>		X	50					F#0 (8)		Pee Paid (5)	
HP = highest no	umber of	total claims paid	for, if gree	ter than 20		— т				-	360 x	L		
Indep. Claims			Extra CI			Fee(\$)		Fee	Paid (\$)	\dashv				
		- 3 or HP=	<u> </u>		×	200								
HP = highest no	umber of	total claims paid	for, if grea	iter than 3				 						
3. APPLICATION of the specification	on and o	drawings exceed	100 sheets	s of paper, the	application	size fee du	ıe is \$	250 for eac	h addition	al 50	sheets or	fract	lon thereof. See	
)91)(G) i	Extra Sheets	1	Number	of each ac	tditional 6	0 or fr	action the	reof		Fee(\$)	П	Fee Paid (\$)	
Total Sheets		EXCIA STIBULE		Number							250			
	- 100 =	·	/50 =		(round up t	o a whole r	numbe	r)		Х	250			
4. OTHER FEE			<u>-</u>										Fees Paid (\$)	
		fication, \$130 fee		of on Associati	44 20/51/21								\$500.00	
Other:	Fee	for filing a Brief	in support	or an Appeal (+ L.&V(D)(&)							_		
SUBMITTED B	Y													
Kobert II. France					ration No. 42,553 Telephone 405-812-5613			2-5613						
Signature	Robert Frantz Date 10/12/05													

Franklin Gray Patents